

When this is sent to a Clergyman, it is intended for him and the Officers of his Church, or his successor.

ANTI-SLAVERY REPORTER.

A Periodical,

CONTAINING A

REVIEW

OF THE

LAW OF RETRIBUTION:

"UNION OF COLONIZATIONISTS AND ABOLITIONISTS,"


&c. &c.

VOL. I. NO. 6.

New-York:

ISSUED MONTHLY, AND FOR SALE AT THE BOOK STORES.

NOVEMBER—1833.

 Postage 100 miles and under, 1½ Cents. Over 100 miles, 2½ Cents.



REVIEW.

The LAW of RETRIBUTION, or a Serious Warning to Great Britain and her colonies, founded on unquestionable examples of God's temporal vengeance against TYRANTS, SLAVE-HOLDERS AND OPPRESSORS, &c. By GRANVILLE SHARP, LONDON 1776, pp. 357.

Granville Sharp must be numbered among those prophets whose sepulchres we are careful to whitewash while we forget their doctrines. In regard to the great enterprise of his life, he was an IMMEDIATE abolitionist, whose uncompromising morality was drawn directly from the word of God. In a case where he had the explicit instruction of Divine inspiration, he took no counsel of human expediency; he pursued no half way measures; he did not reprobate the SLAVE TRADE, and at the same time connive at the primary enormity SLAVE-HOLDING.

The opponents of immediate emancipation profess to marvel that we quote scripture. It is a settled point with them that the Bible permits slavery, or to use their metaphysical language, recognizes the relation between master and slave. Such men would do well to ponder the honest and unanswerable argument of Granville Sharp. The Bible is the charter of the world's liberties. It not only clearly defines and sanctions the rights of man, but it shows by abundant history that oppression in every shape is unprofitable as it is wicked. The Bible nowhere recognizes the right of a man to the person of an offending fellow man as property. It never permitted men to make merchandize of their brethren. It is true that God did doom seven nations* to destruction on account of their enormous sins. He made his own people the executioners of his vengeance by an express commission. They were neither to make "covenant" with them nor show "mercy." They were permitted also to make of them "bondmen and bondwomen" for a perpetual "possession." This was evidently a part of the judgment inflicted upon those wicked nations. The reason why the Israelites were required to

show "no mercy" is expressed and is manifestly peculiar to their case: "For they will turn away thy sons from following me that they may serve other gods, &c."* The repeated triumphs of the living God over idols and the full developments of the christian dispensation, have in a great measure removed the temptation to idolatry which always threatened to overwhelm the ancient Israelites. There is strong reason to believe that the word *heathen* in Lev. 25 : 44. was intended to apply only to the seven devoted nations, and that the permission to enslave, applied only to them and to people of like character dwelling in the immediate vicinity, for in Deut. 10: 18, the Israelites are commanded to "love the stranger." But, be this as it may, this slavery could continue no longer than the slave pleased to remain a heathen. If he embraced the true religion, was circumcised and kept the law, he was to be treated as a *native Hebrew*,† but a Hebrew could not be holden as property, the most rigorous servitude to which he could be subjected, was that of a servant hired for six years and paid in advance.‡ Here then is the plain case; servitude was a divine infliction upon the idolaters, who dwelt about and among the Israelites, for their sins. The Israelites were made the executioners of the sentence—they were to take or buy these idolaters, not to sell again, but as a possession to themselves and their children "forever"—that is, in accordance with the provisions of the law,—so long as they remained idolaters. Is there any recognition of a *right of property* here? If so, then that law which delivers up to the sheriff a score of convicts, and allows him, for compensation, all that he can get by exercising them upon the tread-mill, recognises the sheriff's right of property in their bodies and souls! True, in a certain sense they are his "possession" but not in that sense in which his cattle are, nor in that sense in which two millions of our unoffending fellow men, are claimed as property in this CHRISTIAN REPUBLIC. And moreover, what would

* Deut. 7 : 4.

† Ex. 12 : 48, 49.

‡ Lev. 25 : 39, 42.

* Deut. 7th chapter.

be said of a man who should build a private tread-mill and put upon it the first score of men and women that he could catch, and plead in justification the example of the sheriff? Why, he would only be guilty of the same absurdity as those who quote scripture to support slavery in our own country. God is the owner of those two millions of our fellow men, who are claimed as property and treated worse than machines in this Christian land—"let the usurpers show us their title deeds" from Him.

The sacred volume has been so long abused and overwhelmed by a Jesuitical interpretation, for the sake of supporting the sin of oppression, that many honest minds doubtless find difficulty in reconciling it with the plain dictates of conscience on this point. For this, the Bible is not to blame. The reader who candidly peruses the whole of it, will not fail to see that its principles cut up that sort of slavery which now exists, root and branch; and that God has not shrunk from enforcing these principles by the most fearful sanctions. OPPRESSION is almost uniformly recorded in the Bible history as the crying sin of those nations which the Almighty swept away in his wrath. Nothing but the blindness of bigotry can prevent any one from seeing that freedom is the general law, while involuntary servitude is the special exception.—The passage which has occasioned more difficulty than any other is capable of an easy explanation in accordance with these views.—

"And if a man smite his servant or his maid, with a rod, and he die under his hand; he shall be surely punished. Notwithstanding if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished: for he is his money." Ex. 21: 20, 21. Here is severity permitted for the reasons already mentioned. The law-giver has perfect authority and the subjects are criminals. Power is granted to the master to punish with a severity which might occasion death, and the only check to the exorbitant use of this power, is pecuniary interest. This plainly could apply only to heathen servants. And even these servants might avail themselves of the general provision: "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee: he shall dwell with thee, even among you in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates where it liketh him best; thou shalt not oppress him." Deut. 23: 15.

Such a provision would soon annihilate the slavery which exists in this christian land.—What right have American Slave-holders to plead the authority of the former text, while they so construe our Federal Constitution, as to make it a direct violation of the latter? Before they claim a divine permission to put to death "by moderate correction," let them cease to pursue and re-enslave those who have escaped from their intolerable tyranny. There is a wonderful facility in remembering those passages which seem to favor slavery, while those that positively condemn it are forgotten.

But it is time to notice our author from whom we mean to make copious extracts. He thus introduces his subject.*

THE LAW OF RETRIBUTION.

The African Slave-trade has been publicly supported and encouraged by the legislature of this Kingdom for nearly a century last past; so that the monstrous destruction of the human species, which is annually occasioned thereby, may certainly be esteemed a national crime of the most aggravating kind, which (according to the usual course of God's providence in the world) will probably draw down some exemplary vengeance upon the unrepenting inhabitants of this island! And, with respect to the British Colonies, the uncharitable practice of slave-holding, especially in the West-India Islands and the more southern colonies, is grown up into a more enormous and destructive oppression (whether we view the prodigious multitudes of the oppressed, or the unconscionable severity of the oppressors) than perhaps ever disgraced any other nation at any one period of time.

The several attempts that have lately been made to justify these two branches of abominable national iniquity by the Holy Scriptures, and especially by the permission therein granted to the Israelites to purchase and retain slaves among them, have induced me to collect, from the history of the Jews in the several books of Holy Scripture, some plain examples of God's vengeance upon that particular nation, expressly for this kind of oppression; which, I hope, will sufficiently prove that slavery was ever detestable in the sight of God, and consequently that a speedy reformation is absolutely necessary (as well with respect to the African Slave-trade, encouraged in this Kingdom, as the toleration of slavery in the British American Dominions) if we mean to entertain the least hope of escaping a severe national retribution, which (if we may judge by our present civil dissensions and horrid mutual slaughters of national brethren) seem ready to burst upon us!

The reader will observe that this was written after the commencement of the American revolutionary war.

I am well aware, indeed, how very unfashionable it is, now-a-days, to quote Scripture when matters of Law, Politics, or Trade are called in question; yet I flatter myself that the following examples, drawn from thence, are perfectly suitable to my present point, and consequently must have weight to convince all persons, who sincerely acknowledge the truth of the Scriptures, that we have the greatest reason to apprehend the infliction of some heavy judgment

* In all the extracts, the writer's own emphasis is preserved: it will be perceived that he is not less profuse in the use of capitals, italics, and (!!!!) than a certain celebrated modern abolitionist. If those who have quoted Granville Sharp as a Colonizationist, because he founded Sierra Leone, would say AMEN, to all these paragraphs, we would not care how much they labored to colonize Africa.

from Almighty God upon these kingdoms, on account of the monstrous load of guilt which the British subjects, *on each side of the Atlantic*, have incurred by the *oppressions* above-mentioned.

In some former tracts I have already shown that the servitude which the Jews, by the Mosaic Law, were permitted to exact of their brethren (even when the latter were *sold* to them) was very much *limited*; that they were not to be treated as bond-servants, but as hired servants; that the *servitude* could not lawfully be extended beyond *seven years*, unless the servant loved his master and condition, and voluntarily demanded * of him to be continued in his service; and that, in every other case, it was absolutely unlawful to hold a brother Hebrew in slavery.†

I have likewise shown, that, under the glorious dispensation of the Gospel, we are absolutely bound to consider ourselves as *citizens of the world*; that every man whatever, without any partial distinction of nation, distance, or complexion, must necessarily be esteemed our neighbor, and our brother; and that we are absolutely bound in Christian duty to entertain a disposition towards all mankind as charitable and benevolent, *at least*, as that which was required of the Jews, under the law, towards their

* "And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out free; &c. Exod. xxi. 5. Thus it is evident that the Jews could not acquire any right to the perpetual service of their brethren, John or Thomas, except by virtue of a voluntary contract, which is something similar to that clause in the Habeas Corpus act, concerning a contract, which I thought myself obliged to acknowledge in my former tract as an exception to the idea of universal freedom in this Kingdom. But in neither case can the contract for service be implied; for in the latter the contract must be in writing, and the signing be clearly proved to be a voluntary act, without the least suspicion of Duress; and in the former case it was necessary that the servant should acknowledge, in a court of record, that he was willing to enter into such a contract; for the Hebrew Servant could not be made a slave, unless he would "plainly say, I love my master," &c. "I WILL NOT GO OUT FREE: then" (says the text) "his master shall bring him unto the Judges" (which answers to the public acknowledgment necessary in the other case to be made in a court of record) for without this the Hebrew master had no authority to bore the servant's ear in token of bondage. Exod. xxi. 5, 6.

† It is sometimes said that many of the slaves at the South would not take their liberty if they could have it, therefore we do wrong when we denounce slave holding as necessarily wicked. But if it be true that there are such cases, they do not come under our definition; that is, the common and true definition of slavery, which is, *the involuntary servitude of innocent persons*. Against receiving *voluntary* service we have nothing to say. If a man knows all the hardships and liabilities of any service, and yet chooses it, we would be the last to violate his right of choice. But let those who please, believe—we confess our utter incredulity of the existence of such facts.

ED. REP.

national brethren; and, consequently, that it is absolutely unlawful for those, who call themselves Christians, to exact of their brethren (I mean their brethren of the universe) a more burthensome service than that to which the Jews were limited with respect to their brethren of the House of Israel; and the slavery, or involuntary bondage of a brother Israelite was absolutely forbid.

These premises naturally lead us to consider the severe NATIONAL JUDGMENTS which the Jews brought upon themselves principally by exceeding these very limitations which I have here specified: and the inevitable conclusion to be drawn from these examples is, that we are absolutely in danger of the like judgments, if we do not immediately put a stop to all similar oppression by national authority: because an uncharitable extension of the said limits, by those who call themselves Christians, will certainly be, at least, as heinous in the sight of God as the oppression of brethren under the law. I have clearly proved (I trust) that the permission to the Israelites, to keep bondmen of the Heathen (or more properly the nations, *הַגִּיּוֹם*) that were round about them, and of "the children of the strangers that dwelt among them," cannot be extended to any other people whatever except the Israelites themselves; and that even to them it was only temporary, during the dispensation of the Mosaic Law, whilst they possessed the land of Canaan, the former inhabitants of which, (namely, the seven abominable nations of Palestine, expressly mentioned by name in the seventh chapter of Deuteronomy, where the same Hebrew noun, *גִּיּוֹם*, rendered Heathen in the former text, is properly expressed by the English word nations) the Israelites were expressly directed to drive out, kill, and destroy *without pity*, and to make no covenant with them: and I hope I have also proved that the remainder of these particular wicked nations, thus expressly doomed to destruction, were undoubtedly "the heathen" (or nations) "that dwelt round about" the Israelites, and "the children of the strangers," whom (and whom alone) it was lawful to hold in perpetual bondage; for otherwise that permission cannot be reconciled to God's positive commands, given in the same law, to love the stranger. "The lord your God is God of Gods, and Lord of Lords, a great God, a mighty and a terrible, *which regardeth not persons*." So that this was apparently a general law, or rule of conduct, towards all persons, except the people of those particular nations which were expressly, by name, condemned to destruction by the hands of the Israelites, in other parts of the law, for their abominable wickedness) "nor taketh reward: he doth execute the judgment of the fatherless and widow, and loveth the stranger, in giving him food and raiment.—" LOVE YE THEREFORE the stranger" (and the Almighty inculcates a sympathetic concern for the welfare and happiness of strangers, by

reminding the Israelites of their own unhappy situation formerly in a strange country) "for ye" (says the text) "were strangers in the land of Egypt." Deut. x. 17 to 19. See also Levit. xix. 33, 34. "Thou shalt love him" that is, the stranger) "as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt."

After this introduction commences the grand argument of the book. The proposition is, that OPPRESSION and *especially* SLAVE HOLDING *has never failed to draw down the vengeance of God upon that nation which has practised it.* This is abundantly proved from the scripture history of the Egyptians, the Jews, the Assyrians, the Babylonians, &c. The amount of proof is absolutely overwhelming. Can a man persist in the opinion that the Bible permits or at least does not condemn slavery when its sacred pages teem with the record of God's vengeance upon the nations for this very sin?

From the Spirit of the Pilgrims.

"UNION OF COLONIZATIONISTS AND ABOLITIONISTS."

Mr. Editor.—In the July number of your valuable periodical, I notice an article designed to show the utility, the practicability, and the duty of union between the Colonizationists and abolitionists. I cordially approve, and would heartily maintain a part of the sentiments contained in the article.—I believe that we should, at all times, "maintain the law of love in the heart and on the tongue;" and also that "the present crisis calls evidently for moderation, discretion, and kindness in every thing." It is likewise undeniable that there are wise and good men in the ranks of both the parties; and equally so that their union "as coadjutors in a common cause"—the emancipation of the enslaved, and the elevation of the degraded, is an important and practicable duty.—It is also true, as the writer assumes, at the outset, that in order to effect so desirable a union, it is necessary to institute a critical enquiry into "the exact state of the case between colonization and abolition or anti-slavery," as they exist in the minds and operations of their adherents in this country; or as they may be conceived to exist.

With the hope of throwing some light on the object of this inquiry, the following remarks are submitted. Being, myself, one of that class of your readers who are called Abolitionists, and believing that many of my brethren who hold the same views, agree with me and with you in desiring such an union, and in seeking the diffusion of light as the means of cementing it; I will, with your leave, proceed to specify some of the obstacles which I suppose Abolitionists find, or think they find, in the way of a co-operation between themselves and the Colonizationists. And I do it in the full assurance that if these obstacles can be removed, surmounted, or shown to exist only in imagination or misapprehension, there will be no reluctance

on the part of Abolitionists in general to co-operate with Colonizationists; at least, so far as to "press abolition, and not seek to destroy the colonizationist," that is—on condition of a reciprocity of pacification, an item which it is to be presumed, the writer in your July number, did not intentionally omit to recommend.*

1. In the first place, then, I suppose Abolitionists have found a difficulty in forming Anti-slavery societies, and in "pressing abolition," from the fact that good men, almost every where have been led to suppose that the Colonization Society is sufficient, of itself, to effect emancipation as speedily as it is safe and practicable to do it. This has been abundantly taught by the agents and publications of the society. And just so far as it is believed, just so far that belief stands an insuperable barrier to the formation of an anti-slavery society, or any anti-slavery effort distinct from colonization. Now *every* abolitionist, (if the term is to be used at *all* in distinction from colonizationist) believes of *course*, that the Colonization Society is *not* sufficient for this end; otherwise he would be simply a colonizationist, and not an abolitionist, in any distinctive sense of that term. Unless he relinquishes his belief that emancipation may be safely and speedily effected, without the slow process of Colonization, (which he believes to be far distant, not to say absolutely hopeless, in its efficacy,) he *must* give his reasons for this opinion, before he can possibly produce a single direct effort for *present* emancipation. From the very nature of the case, therefore, Abolitionists are obliged to teach and maintain that colonization is not a sufficient remedy for slavery; just as the advocates of total abstinence are obliged to maintain and teach that all other remedies for intemperance are insufficient. But to maintain and teach this, is generally considered and treated as opposing the Colonization Society. Perhaps it is so. But the question now is, how can it be avoided by Abolitionists, without their ceasing to "press abolition?"

2. The advocates of a direct and present abolition are not only obliged to encounter the impression that Colonization is an adequate and sufficient remedy for slavery, but that it is the *only* safe and prudent remedy. This sentiment has also been inculcated by the Society and its friends, from the beginning. Gen. Harper of Maryland, in his Letter published in the first annual report of the Society says:—"This great end," [i. e. ultimate emancipation] "is to be attained *in no other way* than by a plan of universal colonization."—And within a few months past, this very sentence has been quoted by Mr. Gurley in his correspondence with sundry citizens of New York, as expressive of his own views and those of the "leading friends of the Society."—But in direct opposition to this

* "Let the Abolitionists press abolition, and not seek to destroy the Colonizationist; and the Colonizationist, let him press still harder, Colonization, since that is what he is engaged in." p. 400.

sentiment, every Abolitionist holds that emancipation may be effected more safely and speedily, on the plan of immediate emancipation. In what manner, therefore, shall he "press abolition," in a community where this sentiment has taken deep root, without endeavoring to show its fallacy? But to do this, is to oppose the claim of the Colonization Society, which has been pressed for seventeen years.—The simple inquiry here is, how shall this collision be avoided? Must the Abolitionist give up his distinctive sentiments, and become a Colonizationist, in order to effect a union *between* Colonizationists and Abolitionists? If not, *how* is he to "press abolition?" What arguments may he use, and in what manner shall he proceed?

3. The great extent of this difficulty remains yet to be stated.—Not only is the Colonization Society claimed to be an adequate, and the *only* practicable remedy for slavery; but the advocates of direct and immediate abolition have thus far "pressed," its claims under the pressure of direct and explicit censure.—In his speech before the 11th Annual meeting of the American Colonization Society, Mr. Harrison of Virginia said that the Society "having declared that it is no wise allied to any Abolition Society in America or elsewhere, is ready, whenever there is need, to pass a censure on such societies in America."—This speech was officially published in the 11th Report of the Society, without the least disclaimer, and at a time when no opposition to the Colonization Society on the part of Abolition Societies, could have provoked the censure. It is needless to add that similar censures have been frequently and strongly expressed in the resolutions of Auxiliary Societies, at various places and periods, up to the present time.

As a further illustration of the continued fulfilment on the part of the friends of Colonization, of the promised censure, (when needed,) of Abolition Societies, I might notice the very singular, though not to say unprecedented, frightful, and defamatory epithets so perseveringly bestowed on all, of every temperament and character, who attempt to advocate a direct and present emancipation; a course of opposition, by means of which a panic, a contempt, and an abhorrence are engendered, which to a great extent, exclude them from the pulpit and the press, and which deny them a patient and candid hearing. I name not things like these for the sake of palliation or excuse, still less as a warrant for that propensity to render railing for railing, which may, at times, have been excited among us.—But still I find some difficulty in conceiving how Abolitionists can re-assert and vindicate their claims to sanity, patriotism, benevolence and common sense, without at all impeaching the justice, and wisdom of the award by which these qualities have been so constantly denied them. How shall we, or how can we hope to move against the influence *pledged to crush us with its censures*, without the least degree of resistance against that influ-

ence? Must we not breast the stream, unless we would be borne away by it?—Besides,

4. Every Abolitionist, to be consistent with his creed, must "press abolition" as a present and practicable duty. How can he do this, without pressing *against* the doctrine that would defer it till a future period? How can he preach "Repent to-day," without saying "defer it *not* until a more convenient season?" It has been often stated by advocates of Colonization, that its operations could not touch the question of emancipation within a century to come. The Abolitionists "press abolition" on the *present* generation. Their time, is God's time, "*now*"—"to-day." They address the oppressors *now* on the earth—not their posterity. The oppressor, like every other sinner, pleads delay. The indulgence offered him by Colonizationists is all he asks. He says in his heart, let there be emancipation a century hence, if it needs must be so. But "let there be peace and quietness in my day." Let me not be disturbed while *I* live. Shall the Abolitionist leave him in undisturbed possession of his plea, and of his sin? Or must he strip him of his plea? To do the latter is to strip the Colonizationist of all his pleas, and claims, and plans. Must the Abolitionist "spare direct attack" on the very obstacle that stands in his way, and thus cease to "press abolition" for the sake of an union with Colonizationists?

5. "What is the object of abolition. To do away slavery, and put the colored man in possession of the blessings and privileges of honorable citizenship and Christianity." So says the writer in the Spirit of the Pilgrims, and he says truly. What slavery, and what colored man does the writer speak of? *American* slavery, and the *American* colored man, assuredly. None other do the Colonization or Anti-slavery societies of America intermeddle with, or mention. The object of the Abolitionist then is, to put the American slave and the American colored man in possession of the blessings and privileges of honorable American citizenship, and the blessings and privileges of Christianity in America. It is to *this* citizenship, and to *these* blessings, *if to any*, that the slave, the colored man, has just claims. To no citizenship or privileges in any other country than that of his birth, has he any rightful claims—to none other is his oppressor, or is any one, bound to restore him. To deny the obligation of restoring him *these*, is to deny the obligation of restoring him *any*. Of none other has he been *deprived*: none other would be to him an equivalent. On this point the colored man has a right to speak for himself, and he has spoken, in terms not to be misunderstood.

It is then true that the Colonization and the Abolitionist, are "*both agreed as to the rights of man?*" What says the Colonization Society, and its leading friends, on this point? The sentence already quoted from Gen. Harper's let-

ter, published by the Society at its first commencement, and recently approved by its present Secretary, is sufficiently explicit. "In *no other way*," can emancipation be attained, "than by a plan of *universal Colonization*." In other words "the colored man" must *either* be held "a slave," or *banished* from the enjoyment of his unalienable birthright, "the possession of the blessings and privileges of honorable" American "citizenship and Christianity" in his native land. With Abolitionists it certainly is not "affected," if it be a "childish pity," that makes them feel such "tender mercies" to be "cruelty." They have not thus learned 'the rights of man,' nor can they comprehend why a banishment from the enjoyment of his rights of 'citizenship' should be offered to the American 'colored man,' under the imposing name of a *restoration* of them. They see no need either of their amalgamation with the whites, nor of the white man's emigration to give them room. The presence of the colored slave has never scared the white man from his home. Nor need we fear the colored free man would be either more dangerous or more polluting. Such, at least, are the principles held by the Abolitionists. If Colonizationists deem them "wild chimeras, fit only for the brain of a zealot, or an enthusiast of the most visionary character," and turn with horror from the sober facts of history and geography, teaching that such things are, and have been; the fact but adds fresh emphasis to the enquiry—"How can Abolitionists 'press abolition,' according to *their* views of its essence and of 'the rights of man,' without "opposing the Colonizationist?"

6. How can the Abolitionist "press abolition" without opposing the absurd and unrighteous modern prejudice against color, known only in North America, which practically denies that God has made of one blood all the nations of the earth? On what but this sinful and infidel prejudice, is the whole system of American slavery founded? Nothing. Who believes that the slaves could be held in bondage a fortnight, should their features and complexions become the same as our own?—or should that prejudice become as unknown and imperative here, as it is in Europe? No one. What else but the same prejudice, withholds from the colored man, for an hour, "the blessings and privileges of an honorable" American "citizenship and Christianity?" Nothing. What but the removal of that prejudice can restore him to those blessings and privileges? Nothing. What can the Abolitionist effect, until he has removed that prejudice? Nothing.—*What else has he to effect?* NOTHING. How is he to remove that prejudice, but by opposing it? Will change of place—will "citizenship" in Liberia remove it? It would not. It *does* not.—Liberian Sheriffs and Lieut. Governors, traveling among us, cannot ride in our Northern mail stages, on account of this prejudice. *Is it then, invincible to the force of Christian truth?* No. Truth, and truth alone, can triumph over error.

Holy love can displace contempt, hatred and sin. Every Abolitionist believes this. And he "presses abolition" by teaching and proving it. He can "press abolition" in no other way. In no other way have they ever, either in England or America attempted it.

But what is the Abolitionist, *of necessity, doing*, when he opposes this unholy prejudice?—Does he not, of necessity, oppose whatever *sustains* it? Do not his labors unavoidably tend to *undermine* whatever is *founded* upon it?

But what is the Colonization Society *doing*? and on what is it *founded*? Does it not say repeatedly and repeatedly—I need not quote its voluminous documents—does it not, and do not its friends, at every turn, and with every breath, assure us that this prejudice is insurmountable? Does not the writer in the Spirit of the Pilgrims assume this, when he rejects, as "visionary" the idea of the whites remaining with the blacks at the South (i. e. after they shall become *free*—I know not whether he thinks freedom will increase the prejudice) and supposes that the whites must remove to the North? And what can *sustain* the prejudice in question, so effectually as such grave assurances of its invincibility?

Nay, more. On what is the American Colonization Society *founded*? On what can it rest, for a single hour, but on this same prejudice? What, but this prejudice, induces the desire to send the mass of the colored people out of the country? It is useless to speak here, of the utility of a Colony, and of the good of Africa. Neither the welfare of the colony nor of Africa can require, or admit, the removal of even the annual increase of our colored population. The Liberian officers have attested this, and we all know it to be true. The *only* solid ground for the removal of the mass of our colored population must be the existing prejudice against color. And this is the plea actually made, when we are told that they cannot rise, in this country. And if this prejudice should instantly disappear, or the whole colored population become white, who then would plead for "the plan of *universal colonization*?" No one.

The Abolitionist, therefore, whenever, he "presses abolition"—in other words whenever he *presses against* this prejudice—the sole cause that upholds slavery, and the removal of which alone can remove it, *cannot avoid* "pressing," or seeming to press against the Society that sustains it, and is founded on it. If the Abolitionist succeeds in overcoming this prejudice, there remains no foundation for the Colonization Society, on its present plan. It ceases to exist, of course. On the other hand, if the plea of the Colonizationist respecting the invincibility of this prejudice, proves to be correct, then the Abolitionist fails, of course, in *his* efforts, and can never succeed in putting "the colored man in possession of the blessings and privileges of honorable" American "citizenship and Christianity;" this being the only country in which

he is entitled to them, or, indeed, in which it is expected by any one, that the mass of the race now in this country, and their posterity, will ever exist. [I assume, in this last assertion, the very remarkable fact, that notwithstanding all that has been said of Colonization, as "the only hope" of the colored man, no individual has ever yet been found by the writer, who, after sitting down, for fifteen minutes, to an arithmetical computation, has not frankly owned the prospective removal of the entire mass to Africa, an incredible and improbable consummation.]

How then stands "the exact state of the case, between Colonization and Abolition, or Anti-Slavery," under the item we are now considering. Why, in one word, simply, thus. If the prejudice against color *be perpetuated*, the Colonization Society continues its operations, but not otherwise. If that prejudice *gives way*, the Abolitionist succeeds in his efforts, but not otherwise. At least, such is the apparent state of the case. Is it not really so? If not, how can it be otherwise? How can the scheme of "universal Colonization" succeed without the continuance of that prejudice? How can Abolition succeed, with it? And how can the Abolitionist "press abolition" without pressing against the fundamental principle of colonization?

7. I will mention but one more obstacle in the way of a co-operation between Abolitionists and Colonizationists. That obstacle is found in the position now assumed by the American Colonization Society towards the free people of color. Until recently, it has been supposed that the Society and its friends would frown indignantly on any attempt to remove the free people of color, without their consent. Assurances understood to amount to this, have been repeatedly made, and are even still continued. But with what color of consistency, the following facts may show. The Legislature of Virginia has made an appropriation to the funds of the Society for the purpose of assisting in the removal of the free people of color, in this State. It is carefully provided that these funds shall not be applied to the removal of slaves hereafter set free. It was admitted by the advocates of that law, that its object was the removal, *at all events*, of the free people of color. Some of them went so far as to propose a clause in the same act, providing for their forcible ejection: and the only reason why it did not pass was because it was suggested that the means *heretofore* used, that of whipping, mobbing, &c. could be made to answer all the purposes of a legal enactment, for the present: but if necessary, the legal provision, it was said, could be added afterwards. Such was the enactment appropriating funds for the American Colonization Society, and in direct allusions to its "liberal" provisions, the Secretary of the Society has lately published an advertisement, inviting emigrants from Virginia. This may be called "removing the free people of color with their own consent." But, with their *present* views of the "rights of man," Abolition-

ists cannot but consider it a high-handed and aggravated persecution, and they cannot conscientiously "co-operate" with a Society that "co-operates" with Virginia, in an act so unjust and disgraceful.

Such, I conceive, are the principal obstacles existing in the minds of Abolitionists in general, which prevent a "co-operation between themselves and Colonizationists." If these obstacles can be removed, or shown to be ideal and imaginary, I have no doubt that a "co-operation" between them, will immediately take place.

And, not to be wanting, on our part, I will now specify, in a condensed form, the course I suppose to be necessary in order to produce the desired "co-operation."

Hitherto, I have spoken of Colonization, as I supposed it to exist in the views and plans of its leading friends, including the present Secretary of the Colonization Society. [I have made no mention of the views and plans of those members of the Society, whether a majority or otherwise, who are dissatisfied with the views I have described, and displeased with the members who advocate them; on the ground that they are too favorable to emancipation. That the Society has such members, who really seek to render it subservient to the continuance of slavery, is a fact which no intelligent man will deny; but I wished to put the most favorable construction on the Society, and have only exhibited what I understand to be the views of the *emancipation party*—so called—among the members of the American Colonization Society.] But in distinction from all this, I will now speak of Colonization, as it might perhaps, be conceived to exist, and as it may hereafter exist; nor can I be certain that the picture I shall now exhibit, may not meet the views of very many who now support the present American Colonization Society.

Suppose a Colonization Society to exist, which is not proposed as a remedy, either wholly, or in part, for slavery; suppose it never to have passed or threatened any censure against Abolition Societies, or their supporters; suppose the influence of its leading friends and publications to be in no way hostile to the principles and plans of immediate emancipation; suppose the objects of the two societies in no degree to clash with each other, so that the success of the one should not involve the defeat of the other; suppose the Colonization Society to make no appeals founded on the prejudice of color, or on the supposed impossibility of raising the colored people to the "possession of the blessings and privileges of honorable" American "citizenship and Christianity;" suppose it to hold no communion, and exert no "co-operation" with expatriating Legislatures and other persecutors of the free colored man;—suppose, in a word, that it assumed, toward the colored people, no bearing different from that which would characterize a benevolent association for assisting such white citizens as, without direct or indirect per-

secution, should desire to establish a colony at Oregon, or elsewhere;—suppose it to be a Society for planting a colony in Africa or elsewhere, on Christian principles, for the civilization of Africa, by appropriate moral influences, without the aid of the sword, and unaccompanied with strong drink;—suppose such a Colonization Society, I say, and I have no doubt of an immediate and hearty “co-operation” between such Colonizationists and the friends of immediate emancipation.

And it gives me pleasure to add, that since I commenced writing this article, I have heard it rumored that a distinguished gentleman of your “city of the pilgrims,” heretofore a friend and patron of the American Colonization Society, has conceived the plan of a *new* colony, on principles similar, if not identified with those I have delineated. I hope he will soon publish the details of his plan, and that they may be such as Abolitionists and Colonizationists can unite in adopting.

WILLIAM PENN.

IMMEDIATE COMPARED WITH GRADUAL EMANCIPATION.

A gross misapprehension of the views of abolitionists is generally entertained for want of a distinction between a *DOCTRINE of morals*, & a *PLAN of operations*. When abolitionists plead for instant emancipation and express a confident hope of success, they are taken to be, either blood-thirsty terrorists, who cherish some scheme of physical violence against the slave-holders, or, hair-brained fanatics, who are expecting such a result from moral argument as it never produced since the world began. A storm of mingled indignation and contempt is poured upon their heads as if they were a set of maniacs equally dangerous and ridiculous. The most simple exercise of the understanding, or in other words, a few grains of common sense, applied to this subject, would save the necessity of all this alarm and uproar.

When any great object is to be obtained by the united efforts of many men, certain *propositions* or *doctrines* are laid down and understood in common among them, as the basis of action. This is absolutely required by the necessity of the case. For instance, if a republican government is to be formed, the *doctrine* must first be established that the *majority must rule*. It is of no avail to object that this proposition is an *abstract* one—that it has never been exemplified in the practice of any republic; it is of none the less practical importance. Till it is distinctly apprehended and admitted, nothing like a republic can exist.

Now take the case of *two millions* of American slaves.

The first thing to be done is, to agree what *OUGHT* to be done. Till this point is settled, action is useless. The grand question is, *OUGHT THE SLAVES TO BE FREE?* Suppose it to be replied that this depends upon circumstances. That ‘they ought to be free as soon as they can use

their liberty with advantage to themselves and safety to their masters; but with regard to the great mass of them this cannot be expected, therefore, they *ought not* to be free till they are properly prepared.’ Here is the *DOCTRINE of gradualism*. Look at its influence on the *practice* of the community in regard to slavery. It makes a *portion* of slave-holding innocent, on account of the attending circumstances. But that which is *not* innocent is attended with similar circumstances, hard to be distinguished from the other. Can a man regard himself as very guilty when his conduct differs from innocent, only by a slight shade of circumstances. No, the one melts away into the other by such imperceptible shades, that the line of separation cannot be discerned. The innocent and the guilty join hands over the grand distinction between right and wrong till it is lost, and the *gradualist* cannot morally attack the system for fear of involving the innocent in the same denunciation with the guilty. Thus his false *doctrine* shields the conscience of the guilty and drinks up his own sympathy for the poor slave. The duty of the slave-holder, as he explains it, is not to *free*, but to fit his slave for freedom. But the slave-holder’s safety has been admitted as one of the reasons of this decision; and *he* believes that his *safety* requires him not to enlighten the minds of his slaves, because the more intelligent slaves are the more dangerous; that is, he cannot *safely* set them free, on account of their circumstances, and he cannot safely change the *circumstances* which render his slave-holding *innocent*. Again, the circumstances which justify present slavery, in the opinion of the gradualist, have grown out of slavery itself. A man has been imprisoned till it is doubtful whether he can walk, or till he has come to cherish a settled enmity to his unrighteous persecutor; therefore the prison doors must not be opened *now*, lest, in the first place, the prisoner should not be able to walk out, and lest, in the second place, he should take vengeance on his persecutor. Will his ability to walk ever become greater, or his enmity to his persecutor less, by keeping him shut up? Take another illustration. The trees of a nursery have grown crooked from being planted without order and too thick. Every year, young ones are springing up, and growing still more crooked than the parent stocks. *What ought to be done?* One gardener says, “let them be *immediately* set in good order, at proper intervals. Nature and art will then have a chance to straighten them.” “No,” says another, “I see the evil as clearly as you, and I desire its removal as much, but my advice is to pick out a few of the straightest and transplant them into an orchard by themselves, while we leave the rest to grow straighter where they are. As fast as they become *fit* we will remove them.” Are there not here, two very different *doctrines*, tending to very different practical results? Does not the latter tend to *perpetuate*

the evil, rather than to remedy it? A doctrine, then, is a very important thing.

Let it be understood that our DOCTRINE is, that the slaves OUGHT to be made free, NOW. That those who have the power to FREE, and we believe that the *masters*, individually and collectively, have the power, *ought* to use it *without any delay*. Let it be also understood that our PLAN is, to *persuade the masters and all who have any concern or connection with them, or influence over them*, of the truth of this doctrine; trusting that as soon as they are persuaded of its truth, they will do their duty. Those who are so ready to call us "fanatics," may rest assured that we have had too much experience of the perverseness and obstinacy of wicked men, to expect to accomplish our object *immediately*. But nevertheless we expect to accomplish it. The whole glorious array of harmonious truths is on our side. The consciences of all the oppressors are with us. The moral force of the universe is pledged to support our cause. All the history of the past, cheers us on to strenuous effort. The doctrine of IMMEDIATE EMANCIPATION must *ultimately*, and we hope *speedily*, banish slavery from the face of the earth. Any other doctrine only tends to cover up the sin, and perpetuate the evil.

CHARACTER OF PRES. STORRS.

"The righteous perisheth and no man layeth it to heart; and merciful men are taken away, none considering that the righteous is taken away from the evil to come."

There are certain men standing at the fountain head of mind, exerting a silent unobtrusive influence, to whom the world is more deeply indebted than it ever knows of. They give the first shape and impulse to those who are afterwards known as the champions of truth, the saviors of their country, the benefactors of a world.

Such a man was Pres. Storrs. It would seem to a careless observer, that he was taken away in the very dawn of his labors for the slave.— But he had accomplished more than most men would have done in a long and successful life, entirely devoted to the cause of abolition. Those who have ever come fairly in contact with his purifying, exalting spirit, know that he was no ordinary man. The youth that were trained by him, received an intellectual and moral conformation adapted to the exigencies of every noble christian enterprise. His fellow instructors, among whom he always took the position of a learner, borrowed a strong light from him in all their researches, and in every effort felt themselves borne along by an unseen influence. It was delightful to sit beside a man whose expanded vision could embrace a world, and pier-

cing the mists of false philosophy, could enable him, to hold up the relations of men to each other and to the throne of the Eternal, in clear sunlight. The Anti-Slavery cause owes to the stern morality, the irresistible demonstration and the expanded benevolence of that spirit which is now in heaven, the stand which has been taken in the W. R. College in behalf of the oppressed. The same would have been true, had this stand not been taken in his day. He prepared the materials. While no man could be more stable in his opinions, candor and liberality were the distinctive characteristics of his mind. He had made it one of the fundamental principles in his administration of the College to encourage free discussion on every important subject. If he could not sway the mind by reason and argument, he would not attempt to govern it at all. No sacrifice must be spared to truth, was his maxim. This gave a dignity to his character, which commanded the reverence, not of the neck and the knee, but of the heart. No man, I venture to say, in instructing and governing young men, ever gained more of the substance with less care for the symbols of respect. The collected seriousness of his manner, and the appropriateness and strength of his language gave weight even to common subjects, and clothed every present transaction with the importance of a coming eternity. He made the hearer feel, in spite of himself that he was so linked in with the universe of God, that, while insignificant in himself, every movement of his, affected the destiny of untold millions.

Such being the character of our beloved and lamented Storrs, he was ready to greet the champions of the Anti-Slavery cause as soon as they took the field. In the bold straight forward course of the fearless Garrison, he hailed the harbinger of his country's better days, of the restoration of their rights to two millions of oppressed fellow men:—for he was a firm believer in the efficacy of plain truth. He had seen slavery in the Carolinas, and by close and long continued observation had laid up an abhorrence of it among the very elements of his soul. Never did he neglect to bear his testimony against it as a system of robbery and oppression, which ought to be torn up by the roots. But the formation of an Anti-Slavery Society in New England and the developments of the Colonization delusion, he took for the signal of a mighty effort. And like a giant did he gird himself for the contest. Those only who heard him pour out the

thought and feeling of his full heart on this subject, can judge of the depth of his interest in it. If he ever wished for sound lungs and a long life, it was to plead in every city and village of our land the cause of the oppressed. He commenced this noble work with an ardor and force which was too much for a frame already the victim of excessive labor. It hastened him to the grave. But he has left living monuments.

In a letter to the writer of this, just previous to his death, he says—

"It seems to me that I might employ a state of sound health to much advantage in the College, or if precluded from that field, on the broader field of the world. But God knows best. * * * * If the Board pursue such a course as to forbid the free and temperate discussion of the great question of slavery &c., I shall of course return only to resign my place and withdraw from all connexion with the college. It appears to me that it might be well for the students of the college to present to the Board a respectful memorial and request; if, as I suppose, they regard the liberty of free inquiry and proper discussion and action, relative to all subjects of acknowledged importance, to be a boon not to be parted with."

Thus did he meet the servile intolerant bigotry of the times. Though a man of distinguished prudence, his opposers thought, or rather called him *mad*. They had the effrontery to pretend that the leading influence of the abolition cause at the West was *mised*. But his management of the College under the excitement created by this absorbing topic, showed no more want of sound discretion than it did of energy and decision.—The regular duties and discipline of the College were never relaxed for a moment. Several members of the Board of Trustees, however, were in a panic. They represented the College as distracted by contention to the neglect of its appropriate studies, and, but for the firmness of the President, would have driven the Board into a measure which would have made the College a disgrace to humanity and recreant to the high purpose for which it was professedly founded.—He stood for the right of free discussion and shouldered the responsibility. The result was, that the students at length entered into his views with remarkable unanimity, and such a serenity was restored to the College atmosphere as is wont to succeed a conflict of the elements. This doubtless served to check the tendency of the Board to resort to the "gag law" against a cause which was too strong for them in the field of argument. The law which they contemplated, would have made the College ten-

antless. Thus did this good man leave that precious institution which had been committed to him in the most helpless infancy, and which was his idol, if he ever had one, strong, healthful and free. Long may it nurse the champions of human rights.

In making these remarks I would not be disrespectful to the Board of Trustees. Many of its members, I highly honor. The only fault I have to find with any of them is that they succumb to the heartless, time-serving, negro-hating spirit of their country. They have the consolation that most whom the world calls wise and good and *great*, are on their side.

Let me add, that the death of our beloved President Storrs was worthy of his life. He felt beneath him the everlasting rock; he held with a firm grasp the hand that is 'mighty to save.' The following fact communicated by his brother, at whose house he died, to Pres. Green of the Oneida Institute, formerly his fellow laborer at Hudson, is highly characteristic.

"His attachment to the cause of human rights was touchingly illustrated near the closing hour. The last effort he made to use a pen was to sign his name to the list of principles on emancipation drawn up by the Rev. Mr. Phelps of Boston. He traced the letters of the name of "Charles," but finding that he had transposed a letter, he calmly laid down the pen and requested his brother to write for him. "*Those principles*" he added "*are eternal truths and cannot be shaken. I wish to give them my testimony.*" While he lived, whether in his mind or out, he seemed to have been absorbed by the *great things*, which so much moved his noble soul while at Hudson. His associates in the cause of human rights retained their hold on his heart to the last; and the name of one of them was the last human name that fell from his faltering lips."

May the Lord raise up an abler pen than mine to record his worth, and a thousand friends of the slave to walk in his footsteps. E. W.

THE PROGRESS OF DUPLICITY.

The fundamental mistake of the Colonization Society, in regard to its moral influence upon slavery, was yielding to slave-holders the rightfulness of their tenure, while it pretended to hold out the only practicable scheme of abolition. At the South it recommended its plan, as being the best adapted to give security to the master, while in *no way* did it interfere with his *right*, or even with his *prejudice*. At the North it gave out, that it was opposed to slavery, and would work the entire removal of the system. It was the necessity of *deceiving* both the North and the South into a unity of effort, that compelled Mr. Gur-

ley to perpetrate a most flagrant forgery upon Mr. Clarkson's Letter. The Northern interest of the Colonization Society required that the venerable Clarkson should be represented as its friend; the Southern, that he should say nothing direct or serious about emancipation. The two objects were secured by what Mr. G. would probably call a capital *ruse de guerre*, but which an honest man would call a *forgery*. He substituted for the first three or four sentences of Mr. Clarkson's letter, in which that philanthropist said that he considered the objects of the Society to be First to assist in emancipating all the slaves of the United States, &c. Second, to benefit Africa, his own language, in which nothing at all is said about emancipation.

I do not cite this to show that Mr. Gurley is a peculiarly dishonest man, I am afraid his act is approved by too many, but to show that when a man begins by compromising eternal truths to gain any ends, he is driven forward from duplicity to falsehood.

The truth of this remark will be obvious to those acquainted with certain facts referred to by Mr. Gurley, in the October number of the African Repository.

He says that the Western Reserve College has been extensively represented at the South as being a nursery for educating Abolitionists, and as being under the patronage and control of one or more of their leaders. "We have taken pains," he continues, "to investigate the facts connected with this accusation, and are enabled to state them, from an authentic source, as follows:—

"When the Faculty were chosen, the Abolition question was not agitated in reference to their appointment, and three out of the four, including the President, an able and popular instructor, with some of the tutors, became the zealous advocates of Immediate Abolition, and used strenuous, and to a great extent, successful efforts to convert the students to their own creed. The Trustees, who had not supposed that these gentlemen would pervert their connexion with the College to the purpose of introducing that distracting question within its walls, on finding the error of this reasonable calculation, first adopted such mild measures as, it was supposed, would deter them from going farther out of the line of their academical vocation; but finding such measures to be ineffectual, intimated to them that their voluntary retirement from office, would prevent a painful resort on the part of the Board, to a harsher alternative. Two of them, availing themselves of the suggestion, resigned; the third, the Rev. Charles B. Storrs, the President of the College, was then absent on account of ill health, and has since died, greatly regretted by all his friends; and Mr. Nutting, the only remaining member of the Faculty, was understood to have regarded with great pain the course of his Colleagues on the subject under view.

"The project of converting the College into a Seminary for educating Abolition Missionaries, who should spread their creed over the country without regard to public safety or constitutional duty, has thus been resisted, and we trust effectually, by the firmness of the Trustees.

So it seems from Mr. Gurley's story, that the opposers of Abolition and friends of Colonization, not being able to meet the instructors of the college in fair argument, have been compelled to resort to characteristic "*measures*" to put down discussion! Loth as I am to deprive Mr. Gurley of his delightful reflections over this piece of Colonization intolerance, I am obliged to say that much of his tale is false, in point of fact, and the whole is adapted to give an erroneous impression. The trustees, so far from adopting any measures to deter the instructors "from going farther out of the line of their academical vocation" did not express an opinion that they had gone out at all. They never intimated to any instructor, to my knowledge, that his "voluntary retirement from office, would prevent a painful resort on the part of the Board, to a harsher alternative." Certainly no one ever availed himself of any such "suggestion." That individual members of the Board urged such action is certainly true; but, the two resignations were no more the result of their movements, than was the death of the excellent President. Indeed, Mr. Gurley and his cause have quite as much reason to triumph over the latter event as the former, inasmuch, as, while the President is removed to a place where Colonization is never discussed, the other instructors left their places, voluntarily, that they might do more to raise up "ABOLITION MISSIONARIES," here at home! Granting that all these removals were the results of Mr. Gurley's supposed "*firmness of the Trustees*," it seems no more likely to check the hated heresy than did the persecution that arose about Stephen, to smother the gospel.—The "leaders" have left that college pretty thoroughly converted, thanks to the captive's God; and they are now sowing the same seed elsewhere. Why should Mr. Gurley, in his characteristic manner, attempt to deceive the South on this subject too? Will Northern abolitionism be less exasperating to the South if hid till it bursts upon them in full maturity?

The Southern readers of the African Repository ought to know that a majority of the Trustees of the W. R. college would have taken the attitude which Mr. Gurley has attributed to them, if they had done it at all, only on the ground that the views of the Faculty were unpopular, and their inculcation upon the students would deprive the college of funds and patronage. This appears from the fact that one of the Trustees presented a constitution at the Anti-Slavery convention, which, in his own language, standing on the same page in the African Repository, conceded "*every material point to the Abolitionists*;" and the Trustees, except one thorough Anti-Slavery man, were in attendance to vote for it. The conclusion is irresistible, that Abolition is too deeply rooted there to be eradicated without tearing up the foundation of the college.

I am happy to be able, on the best authority, to assure those whom the African Repository takes such pains to deceive, that there is hardly a college North

of the dividing rivers, which does not contain a growing band, who have resolved, before the God of Justice, never to make truce with their country's giant sin, while He gives them a hand to grasp the pen, or breath enough to plead for human woe.

ELIZUR WRIGHT, JR.

HOW LAW PROTECTS LIBERTY IN GEORGIA!

The following narrative is from the pen of a highly respectable and philanthropic gentleman, now a citizen of Connecticut, who resided *twelve years* in Georgia, became thoroughly acquainted with Slavery as it is, had good reason from his own sufferings to know that *justice* and *truth* do not find a home under the system, and on his return to the north generously brought the subject of this narrative along with him. I need not say he is an abolitionist who now puts no confidence in the scheme of Colonization. He relates these facts to show that the free black at the South "is liable to be defrauded and deceived a thousand ways—often out of liberty and all."

An eminently persevering and pious woman, in the meridian of life, thought, if she could hire herself from her owner, she might manage to save a tithe of her daily earnings until, in time, it would amount to the price of her freedom. Animated by this hope, through all her days of toil, like the Hebrew Mother, "With invocations to the living God, she twisted every slender reed together, and with a prayer did every ozieer weave."—Long, and late, and faithfully did she struggle. Before thirteen years were numbered, she had paid \$600 into the hands of her master, the price of her liberty; and for a time, vainly thought her servitude at an end. For a time, her joy was too great for utterance. None but a slave, knows the brightness of that morning which first dawns upon the liberated captive. Somewhat akin to the joyous effulgence of the soul's renovation, it inspired in her an unlimited benevolence towards her species. Free, herself, she resolved at once, to attempt the ransom of her husband.—This, too, she accomplished in about four years thereafter. But, strange to say, this same husband, corrupted by the temptations of avarice, and the intrigues of a despicable Negro-driver, finally sold again, into slavery, the wife of his bosom! She, whose toil and tears had redeemed him from the house of bondage.—Most true it is, that no such sale is recognizable at Law.—But then, what has Law, or justice to do with a poor woman, destitute of friends, *anywhere*? As between the negro driver and his cattle, it has long since winked itself blind. Suffice it to say, for poor Katharine, there was now no alternative but to work out her captivity a second time! A gentleman—one of the "white savages of the North," as we are called,—alike distinguished for his private virtues and humanity, generously undertook to befriend her. He became responsible to her pretended master for her yearly hire, until she had regained over and above these required wages, a sum sufficient to purchase a quit-claim of her person. Hope, once more darted an evanescent beam upon the worn-out—heart-broken captive. But this humane gentleman,—I speak of Mr. Chauncy Rowe, late of Farmington, of this state, returned to his native country, and the poor woman again fell among thieves. Fictitious claims were set up against her former owners, for which she was vio-

lently apprehended, and threatened being sold again, if she did not pay the debt. She paid it; and was seized again under a similar pretence. Her cup was now full! "There was no flesh in man's obdurate heart;" and she wearied Heaven with her cries. At this crisis, another gentleman, not quite callous to the obligations of humanity, instituted a thorough investigation into the merits of the case,—found, of a truth, that the history of her wrongs was as I have narrated them; and being on the eve of visiting the North with his family, conveyed her thence, to this asylum of liberty, where she is now both contented and happy.

SLAVE TRADE IN THE UNITED STATES.

The following anecdotes are from the testimonies of two Wesleyan Missionaries, Rev. Messrs. Gilgrass and Pennock. The facts occurred in the West Indies. But how many such scenes occur, think we, in *free* America, where 6,000 slaves are driven to market yearly from a single state—where children are sold for gambling debts—where pious men and women are flogged for praying—where it is made a crime to teach a slave to read the Bible—and where, among all our pious divines, there is not one in a hundred who dares to *preach* against the sin—I might say, who does not *apologize* for it! Let it be remembered that the internal *slave trade* is now going on in our country, with a tremendously increased activity. The cholera, which has *emancipated* multitudes from their earthly captivity, at the extreme South, has created a demand which has increased the price of slaves 30 or 40 per cent. in Virginia. We have been informed within a few days, by a gentleman who had visited them, that the jails of the District of Columbia and Baltimore, are crowded with slaves. In the latter place, out of 110 confined in one jail, 70 were slaves confined for *safe keeping* till they should be *safe* in the hands of the *man trader*! Does not the cry of this oppression enter into the ears of a God of justice?

"A master of slaves, who lived near us in Kingston, Jamaica, exercised his barbarities on a Sabbath morning, while we were worshipping God in the chapel, and the cries of the female sufferers have frequently interrupted us in our devotions. But there was no redress for them or for us. This man wanted money; and one of the female slaves having two fine children he sold one of them, and the child was torn from her maternal affection. In the agony of her feelings she made a hideous howling, and for that crime was flogged. Soon after he sold her other child. This 'turned her heart within her,' and compelled her into a kind of madness. She howled night and day in the yard, tore her hair, ran up and down the streets and the parade, rending the heavens with her cries, and literally watering the earth with her tears. Her constant cry was, '*Da wicked Massa, he sell me children. Will no buckra Massa pity nega?*'"

What me do? Me have no child. As she stood before my window, she said, 'My Massa,' lifting up her hands towards heaven, 'do, me Massa Minister, pity me? Me heart do so;' (shaking herself violently.) 'me heart do so, because me have no child; me go a Massa house, in Massa yard, and in me hut, and me no see em;' and then her cry went up to God. I durst not be seen looking at her."

"A few years ago it was enacted that it should not be legal to transport once established slaves from one island to another; and a gentleman owner finding it advisable to do so before the act came in force, the removal of a great part of his live stock was the consequence. He had a female slave, highly valuable to him, (and not the less so for being the mother of eight or nine children,) whose husband was the property of another resident on the island, where I happened to be at the time. Their masters not agreeing on a sale, separation ensued, and I went to the beach, to be an eye-witness of their behaviour in the greatest pang of all. One by one the man kissed his children, with the firmness of a hero, and blessing them, gave his last words,—(oh! will it be believed, and have no influence upon our veneration for the negro?) "Farewell, be honest and obedient to your master!"—At length he had to take leave of his wife; there he stood, (I have him in my mind's eye at this moment,) five or six yards from the mother of his children, unable to move, speak, or do any thing but gaze, and still to gaze on the object of his long affection, soon to cross the blue wave for ever from his aching sight. The fire of his eyes, alone gave indication of the passion within, until, after some minutes, standing thus, he fell senseless on the sand, as if suddenly struck down by the hand of the Almighty; nature could do no more; the blood gushed from his nostrils and mouth, as if rushing from the terrors of the conflict within; and amid the confusion occasioned by the circumstance the vessel bore off his family forever from the island! After some days he recovered and came to ask advice of me! What could an Englishman do in such a case? I felt the blood boiling within me, but I conquered; I brow-beat my own manhood, and gave him the humblest advice I could afford."

RUM AND GUNPOWDER, vs. HEATHENISM AND THE SLAVE TRADE!!

An article in the Commercial Advertiser of Nov. 21, professes to contradict the statement that 1400 barrels of RUM have been sold in the colony of Liberia in one year; and to "put down by clear and undeniable proof" the charge that the *Colonization Society facilitates the Slave trade.*" This "undeniable proof" is contained in an examination of Messrs. Williams & Roberts, by a committee of the N. Y. City Colonization Society. It bears date, Sept. 17, 1833. Considering the great exultation with which it is brought forward by the Editor of the Commercial, it is difficult to assign any reason why it should have been kept from the public so long, except to save the witnesses the trouble of a cross examination.

In the absence of the witnesses, let us see how their testimony contradicts the story of the "1400 barrels."

They say, "it is not true that there has been any thing like 1400 barrels of ardent spirit sold there in any one year." And this statement they fortify by saying that there are only "three stores that RETAIL," and

that "they cannot sell by less quantity than a gallon on penalty of \$30, &c." They proceed to state also, that there are no "grog shops," and but two drunkards in the colony; that "there are comparatively little ardent spirits drank in the colony. It is rather a place of deposit, where it is held until it is disposed of in trade to the NATIVES and OTHERS." So we supposed. The witnesses, then, if we understand them, do not deny that "1400 barrels" have been "disposed of in trade to the natives and others"; but that so much has been *retailed* to the Colonists. Else, why do they say any thing about the "three stores that retail," the "no grog shops," and "two drunkards"? No abolitionist that we know of, has accused the Colonists of *retailing* or *drinking*, but simply of *selling*, or if they please, *disposing of in trade* to the natives and others, 1400 barrels of Rum, besides other ardent spirits, in one year. Saying nothing of the morals of the Colonists, we have regarded this as injurious to the natives, and nothing less than a *facility* to the slave traders.

But, if this exquisite piece of ambiguity is to be considered a contradiction of the "RUM Story," let us look farther. We have no disposition to magnify this mischief. We are ready to leave it in the light of the following evidence. From three or four numbers of the *LIBERIA HERALD*, the only ones that have ever fallen into our hands, we extract the following advertisements, almost the only ones contained in those papers.

No. 1. From the *Lib. Herald*, of March 22, 1832
"C. M. WARING & F. TAYLOR,

OFFER for Sale the cargo of the schooner Olive, from Liverpool—

500 KEGS Powder
500 Muskets
150 Cutlasses
10 Bags of Shot
10 Puncheons of Rum
2 do Brandy
20 Casks Pale Ale
10 do Brown Stout
&c. &c."

No. 2. From the *Lib. Herald*, Sept. 7, 1832.

"C. M. WARING, offers for sale, the cargo of the schr. Olive, of Liverpool."

Among other things are,

"50 dozen black handle spear pointed Knives
10000 best Musket Flints
354 bunches dark straw Beads
223 pounds black pound do.
245 do white do do.
1196 gallons Rum
250 kegs Powder
140 Muskets."

The accounts of the commercial activity of Liberia, as well as the addition of the "Spear pointed knives, &c." forbid the supposition that this was the remainder of the former "cargo."

"He also offers for sale, the cargo of the schooner Hilarity, of Philadelphia, consisting of
Pork, Mackerel, Whiskey, Hams, &c."

No. 3. From the *Lib. Herald*, of May 20, 1833.

"F. DEVANY offers for sale at his Stone Warehouse, on Water-street, the following goods, landed from on board the schooner Edgar, of New-York, viz:

9 hds. of Tobacco, 23 puncheons Rum; casks of pint and half pint Decanters, &c. boxes of Beads, white handle *spear pointed Knives*, &c. United States Muskets, Guns, brass Blunderbusses, &c. &c."

The reader will be able to form some opinions from these notices, as to the *probability* of 1400 barrels "of ardent spirits" being "disposed of in trade" in one year, by the Colonists.

But we have evidence of a still more painful character. A gentleman,* well known in this city, who has been for several years established as a merchant in Liberia, was in Boston summer before last, and there made replies as follows, to questions put to him by Mr. Joshua Coffin, a member of the New England Anti Slavery Society.

Question.—How many of the Colonists obtain their whole support by agriculture?

Answer.—Not one.

Question.—What then do they do for a living?

Answer.—Those who are able are engaged in trade, those who are not able work as laborers in loading and unloading ships, as porters, &c.

Question.—How do your people like the Colonization Society?

Answer.—We have a strong Anti-Colonization party in Liberia.

Question.—How much RUM is sold in Liberia in a year?

Answer.—ABOUT 400 TUNS. [We know of no measure which could make this less than 3000 bls. There can be no question that it far exceeds 1400, as was erroneously stated. It will be remarked that this is RUM, exclusive of brandy, gin, whiskey, &c.]

Question.—Who sells the most Rum next to the firm of Russwurm & Co?

Answer.—THE REV. COLSTON M. WARING.

Question.—What do your laborers do for a living when no ships are in?

Answer.—They live on us, either by *begging* or *stealing*. [This accounts for Sheriff Roberts' "petty thefts."]

* J. R. Dailey. We disclose his name, since his statement in regard to the RUM was denied by R. S. Finley, Esq. in the recent debate in Philadelphia.

[From the Liberator.]

TO THE MEMORY OF CHARLES B. STORRS,
Late President of Western Reserve College.

BY JOHN GREENLEAF WHITTIER.

'He fell a martyr to the interests of his colored brethren. For many months did that mighty man of God apply his discriminating and gigantic mind to the subject of Slavery and its Remedy: and, when his soul could no longer contain his holy indignation against the upholders and apologists of this unrighteous system, he gave vent to his aching heart, and poured forth his clear thoughts and holy feelings in such deep and soul-entrancing eloquence, that other men, whom he would fain in his humble modesty acknowledge his superiors, sat at his feet and looked up as children to a parent.'—*Correspondent of the 'Liberator,' 16th of 11th Mo. 1833.*

Thou hast fallen in thine armor—

Thou martyr of the Lord!—

With thy last breath crying—'Onward!'

And thy hand upon the sword.

The haughty heart derideth,

And the sinful lip reviles,

But the blessing of the perishing
Around thy pillow smiles!

When to our cup of trembling
The added drop is given—
And the long-suspended thunder
Falls terribly from Heaven,—
When a new and fearful freedom
Is proffered of the Lord
To the slow-consuming famine—
The Pestilence and Sword!—

When the refuges of Falsehood
Shall be swept away in wrath,
And the Temple shall be shaken
With its idol to the earth,—
Shall not thy words of warning
Be all remembered then?—
And thy now unheeded message
Burn in the hearts of men?—

Oppression's hand may scatter
Its nettles on thy tomb,
And even Christian bosoms
Deny thy memory room—
For lying lips shall torture
Thy mercy into crime,
And the slanderer shall flourish
As the bay-tree for a time.

But, where the South-wind lingers
On Carolina's pines—
Or, falls the careless sunbeam
Down Georgia's golden mines—
Where now beneath his burthen
The toiling slave is driven,—
Where now a tyrant's mockery
Is offered unto Heaven,—

Where Mammon hath its altars
Wet o'er with human blood,
And Pride and Lust debases
The workmanship of God—
There shall thy praise be spoken,
Redeemed from falsehood's ban,
When the fetters shall be broken,
And the slave shall be a man!

Joy to thy spirit brother!—
A thousand hearts are warm—
A thousand kindred bosoms
Are baring to the storm.
What though red-handed Violence
With secret Fraud combine,
The wall of fire is round us—
Our Present Help was thine!

Lo—the waking up of nations,
From Slavery's fatal sleep—
The murmur of a universe—
Deep calling unto deep!—
Joy to thy spirit, brother!—
On every wind of Heaven
The onward cheer and summons
Of FREEDOM'S SOUL is given!

Glory to God forever!—
Beyond the despot's will
The soul of Freedom liveth
Imperishable still,
The words which thou hast uttered
Are of that soul a part,
And the good seed thou hast scattered
Is springing from the heart.

In the evil days before us,
And the trials yet to come—
In the shadow of the prison,
Or the cruel martyrdom—
We will think of thee, O, Brother!
And thy sainted name shall be
In the blessing of the captive,
In the anthem of the free.

